GOVERNMENT BILLS

The Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages University Bill, 2006

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MD. ALI ASHRAF FATMI): Sir, on behalf of Shri Arjun Singh, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to establish and incorporate a teaching University for promotion and development of English and other Foreign Languages and their Literature, and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI MD. ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE APPROPRIATION (NO.3) BILL, 2006

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2006-07, as passed by Lok Sabha be taken into consideration."

Sir, with your permission, may I say a few words on the Appropriation Bill and the expenditure planned for 2006-07? Sir, as you are aware, this Government has placed great emphasis on flagship programmes in the *Bharat Nirman*. We have addressed the revenue side and we think that in the next year, for the third year in succession, gross tax revenues will be increased by about 20 per cent. That is an unprecedented run of three years. I know, hon. Member, Dr.Malaisamy, asked me, "Can it be done year after year?", which I answered one day, "It can't be done unless you widen the tax base". But we are going to make another effort next year to keep the momentum up, that the gross tax revenues increase by 20 per cent. At the same time, we are adhering to the fiscal discipline and we will bring the fiscal deficit down to 3.8 per cent of the GDP. Between these two numbers, the gross tax revenue and the fiscal deficit, lie Plan expenditure and non-Plan expenditure. As hon. Members are aware, non-Plan expenditure is largely committed expenditure - interest, defence, salaries and pensions, and subsidies. It is only in Plan expenditure that we have room to prioritise our expenditure and give more money to sectors which deserve

more money. I believe that adhering to the path of fiscal prudence, I have allocated large sums of money to both the flagship programmes and the Bharat Nirman. For example, in Bharat Nirman, which has six components, in 2005-06, according to the Revised Estimates, we will spend about Rs.13,907 crores. In 2006-07, according to the Budget Estimates, we propose to spend Rs.19,415 crores. There is a whopping increase of nearly 40 per cent. Likewise, in the flagship programmes, and let me repeat what these eight flagship programmes are--(1) Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, (2) Mid-Day Meal Scheme, (3) National Rural Health Mission, (4) ICDS, (5) Rural Employment which includes NREGP and SGRY, (6) Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission, (7) Rajiv Gandhi Rural Drinking Water Mission, and (8) Rural Sanitation including the North-East Region component--in 2005-06, according to the Revised Estimates, we will spend approximately Rs.39,500 crores. In the next year, we propose to spend approximately Rs.55,000 crores. Thanks to the buoyancy in tax revenues, we are able to allocate larger and larger sums of money for what Parliament considers important, what Parliament considers an advance towards social justice and equity. I am happy that I have the support of the Parliament on these programmes and we are able to allocate large sums of money.

Sir, we are not deviating from the fiscal discipline. We are abiding by the FRBM Act and yet, because of widening the tax base, improving the tax administration and keeping the tax rates moderate and stable, we are able to garner resources and we are able to allocate money to the flagship programmes and Bharat Nirman. I seek the support of the House for the Appropriation Bill.

The question was proposed.

श्री कृपाल परमार (हिमाचल प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद सभापति महोदय, आपने मुझे इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोलने का मौका दिया। माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में सब का समर्थन चाहा है, मैं भी इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिए ही खड़ा हुआ हूं। लेकिन इसके दौरान मुझे मिले समय का उपयोग, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान असल भारत की ओर आकर्षित करने में लगाना चाहता हूं। माननीय मंत्री जी ने भारत निर्माण की बात कही है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में दो तबके हैं, एक जिसे इंडिया कहा जाता है, जो शहरों में बसता है और दूसरा, जिसे भारत कहा जाता है, जो ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में बसता है। मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में भारत निर्माण की बात तो कही है, लेकिन मुझे इसमें इंडिया ही डवलप होता नजर आ रहा है और इसमें ग्रामीण क्षेत्र को बखूबी नजरअंदाज किया गया है। माननीय मंत्री जी के बजट में कृषि को नजरअंदाज किया गया है। सिंचाई की योजना के लिए और विशेषकर ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में सिंचाई की योजना को उपयुक्त धन नहीं दिया गया है। आपके बजट से जहां व्यापारिक और औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में खुशहाली आई है, सेंसेक्स छलांगें लगाता हुआ दस

हजार के आंकड़े को पार कर गया है। लेकिन मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं कि ग्रामीण भारत में आज भी किसान अपनी आय को बढ़ाने के लिए सरकार की ओर बड़ी ललचायी नजरों से देख रहा है, शायद सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ आए। माननीय सभापति जी, जो शेयर बाजार फरवरी, 2005 में 3656 था, वह वर्ष 2006 के फरवरी माह में 10422 हो गया और आज के दिन में यह 11000 हजार को छू रहा है, यह खुशी का विषय है, लेकिन शेयर बाजार की उछाल को देखकर हम हिन्दुस्तान के 70 फीसदी लोगों को नजरअंदाज नहीं कर सकते। कृषि में लगातार लागत बढ़ रही है, सबसिडी कम हो रही है, डीजल और खाद के भाव बढ़ रहे हैं, लेकिन सरकार समर्थन मूल्य को बढ़ाने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। दो-तीन दिन पहले श्री मोती लाल वोरा जी के बयान के संदर्भ में अखबारों में खबर छपी थी कि गेहूं का उत्पादन मूल्य किसान को 700 रुपये से भी अधिक पड़ता है और सरकार उसको 650 रुपये समर्थन मूल्य दे रही है यानी हर एक क्विंटल अनाज पैदा करने पर कृषक को सरकारी आंकड़ों के मुताबिक 50 रुपये अपनी जेब से डालने पड़ते हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूं कि यदि इसी तरीके से किसान दबता रहा, तो जिस तरह से यूरोपीय संघ और अमेरिका में किसान खेती से विमुख हुआ है, अगर भारत में भी ऐसा हुआ, तो भारत में खाने के लिए अनाज के दानों के लाले पड़ सकते हैं।

(श्री उपसभापति पीठासीन हुए)

माननीय मंत्री जी ने राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार योजना के लिए बहुत बड़ी रकम तो उपलब्ध करवाई है, लेकिन मंत्री जी ने इसमें 24000 करोड़ रुपया, काम के बदले अनाज को भी शामिल कर दिया है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जैसे ये दोनों स्कीमें अलग-अलग चल रही थीं - काम के बदले अनाज स्कीम को अलग किया जाये ताकि ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में रोजगार के और अवसर उपलब्ध हो सकें। इसमें भी कुल मिलाकर ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में एक परिवार के केवल एक सदस्य को 100 दिन का रोजगार मिलेगा, जो कि पर्याप्त नहीं है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूं कि इसको बढ़ाने का प्रयास करें।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूं कि पिछले 20 सालों में कृषि का मुनाफा स्थिर है, लागत बढ़ रही है, जिसके कारण बहुत से किसान कर्जे और ब्याज के बोझ से दब रहे हैं और पिछले 3-4 सालों में, हिन्दुस्तान भर में 26 हजार किसानों ने आत्म हत्या की है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूं कि किसान एक ऐसा शख्स है, जो कभी भी कर्जे की रकम को मारता नहीं है, कभी भी ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में बैंकों का कर्जा मरता नहीं है, लेकिन कर्जे की शर्तों को ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में और शहरी क्षेत्र में अलग-अलग रखा गया है। माननीय मंत्री जी, मैं इस चीज को इस तरीके से मानता हूं कि जो सख्ती और फर्क ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में और शहरी क्षेत्र में, किसान के लिए और उद्योगपति के लिए अलग-अलग रखा गया है, यह भारत के जनमानस का अपमान है। मैं मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि कर्जे की शर्तों को ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में और शहरी क्षेत्र में एक जैसा रखा जाये। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूं कि पिछले दिनों स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया ने एक विज्ञापन दिया कि आप सम्पत्ति के बदले में कर्जा ले सकते हैं। मेरे गांव के, मेरे एक रिश्तेदार ने स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया, देहरा गोपीपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश में लोन के लिए एप्लाई किया। उन्होंने अपना आदमी भेजा कि जाओ प्रोपर्टी की वैल्युशन करो, प्रोपर्टी की वैल्युशन करी, सारे कागजात तैयार हो गये और बाद में उन्होंने इस कारण से लोन देने से इन्कार कर दिया कि हम सिर्फ शहरी प्रोपर्टी को pledge करके ही लोन देते हैं, ग्रामीण

प्रोपर्टी को pledge करके लोन नहीं देते हैं। माननीय मंत्री जी अगर ऐसा भेदभाव ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के साथ और किसानों के साथ होगा, तो वह दिन दूर नहीं जब लोग और आत्म हत्या करने की तरफ बढ़ेंगे, क्योंकि कर्जे के लिए ज्यादा ब्याज, ज्यादा कड़ी शर्तें ग्रामीण क्षेत्र को खुशहाल बनने से रोक रही हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में ऐसा ही एक और उदाहरण लाना चाहता हूं कि एलआईसी की हाउस लोन योजना है। इसमें पहले तीन लाख रुपये तक किसी भी घर को pledge करके लोन दिया जाता था। लेकिन पिछले 6 महीने से एलआईसी ने ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के घरों को प्लेज करके लोन देना बंद कर दिया है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूं कि वे अपने कार्यालय में ऐसी व्यवस्था करें, जिससे किसानों के साथ, ग्रामीण भारत के साथ, कृषि के क्षेत्र में ऐसा भेदभाव आपके मंत्रालय द्वारा न हो। अंत में, मैं मंत्री जी को सुझाव देना चाहता हूं कि इन सब समस्याओं का एक ही समाधान है कि जिस प्रकार भारत में रेल और जनरल बजट अलग-अलग होता है, उसी तर्ज पर भारत की जनता, जो 60 फीसदी गांवों में रहती है, जो कृषि पर आधारित है और कृषि उद्योग, जो हिन्दुस्तान के साठ फीसदी लोगों को प्रत्यक्ष रूप में और बीस प्रतिशत लोगों को परोक्ष रूप में रोजगार मुहैया करवाता है, आज वह खुद बीमारी के कगार पर, मरणासन्न खड़ा है, अगर माननीय मंत्री जी उसे बचाना चाहते हैं तो मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूं कि रेल बजट की तर्ज पर हिन्दुस्तान में ग्रामीण और कृषि बजट भी अलग किया जाए ताकि लोगों को यह अहसास हो सके कि हमें क्या मिलता है और क्या नहीं मिलता, हमने देश के लिए क्या किया और देश की सरकार ने हमारे लिए क्या किया। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करता हूं ...**(व्यवधान)**... बोलिए, पहले मैं आपकी बात का जवाब दे देता हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं नहीं, आप बोलिए। जवाब नहीं, आप जो बोलना चाहते हैं, केवल वही बोलिए।

श्री कृपाल परमार : मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यही निवेदन करता हूं कि रेलवे बजट की तर्ज पर कृषि का बजट अलग किया जाए ताकि इस देश के किसान को और खुशहाल होने का मौका मिले, वह अपने दुख-तकलीफ को देश के सामने रख सके और देश की तरक्की में अन्न के दाता को खुद भूखा मरने से बचाया जा सके। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं इस एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल का समर्थन करता हूं और मंत्री जी से अगले बजट में कृषि के बजट को अलग करने की मांग करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Hon. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Appropriation Bill, 2006. I rise to support to this Bill moved by the hon. Finance Minister. If we go through the Bill, we find that the thrust has been on the development of the rural areas. In fact, it has been the policy of the Government that rural development is given the focus, and the National Common Minimum Programme also envisages this. Some of our Alliance parties have also been insisting that the real focus should be on the farmers, the rural households, education in the rural areas, taking care of health sector on the rural side, sanitation, potable drinking water, building of proper roads in the rural areas and creating adequate infrastructure in the

rural areas, in the same away it is available for people in the urban areas. Sir, our hon. President has also urged the need for this; in fact, our hon. Prime Minister and our hon. Finance Minister have showed their keenness to develop the rural areas by providing urban facilities in the rural areas. That has been the focus of this Government, and it has been very well projected in the Appropriation Bill and also the General Budget which was presented by the Finance Minister.

Sir, while hearing my colleague from the other side, Shri Kripal Parmar, he has urged upon the Government not to merge the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme with the other anti-poverty programmes that have been implemented by the various State Governments. He wants that the programme, which has been continuing for sometime now, that is, the 'Food-for-Work' Programme also has to continue. The hon. Finance Minister knows pretty well about this; in fact, I had also made a complaint earlier while I was speaking on the discussion on the Ministry of Rural Development. Ninety per cent of the money has been provided by the Central Government. Ten per cent is the State component for the Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. Most of the States have been enrolling beneficiaries. There is very good response from the people, especially people living in the tribal areas, rural areas, drought-prone areas and from the people who are living below the poverty line; they are enrolling themselves in various States. It is estimated that 25-30 million people will be coming under the net and the amount which is expected to be spent on this scheme is about Rs.25,000 crores. I would like a categorical answer from the hon. Finance Minister because the hon. Prime Minister had said on several occasions while launching the programme, when the hon. Chairman of the National Advisory Council also was there in Andhra Pradesh, and the Finance Minister has also been saying in several meetings, that funds for the scheme are not a problem. I would like to know from the hon. Finance Minister whether the Government is going to give sufficient funds for implementing the scheme even in the first year. Initially, about 200 districts have been included. They have said that, thereafter, they will include other districts in a phased manner and cover all the areas within five years. There are demands from various State Governments and, so, in the next year, more States will have to be included. I would like to know whether any survey has been done to include the other districts also in various States so that the whole area can be covered in the next year. Sir, people in rural areas need safe drinking water, good education, health facilities and also sanitation. Bharat Nirman, the flagship programme, an ambitious

programme that has been launched by the Finance Minister has been welcomed by the people. In the earlier period, there was a thrust in the Budget for industrial development and also developing all the urban areas. This year's Budget is totally for the poor people and the people living in the rural areas. Therefore, if you look at all the newspapers and the comments that have come after the presentation of the Budget by the Finance Minister, you will find that a positive response has come from all sections because there is a felt need to improve the living conditions of people in the rural areas and, secondly, to improve their standard of life, bringing the people living below the poverty line to above the poverty line. Only then, will we able to achieve the overall development of this country. Therefore, that has been the focus of this Government. I congratulate the Government in this regard.

About the farm credit, the hon. Finance Minister has fixed 7 per cent interest rate up to a loan of Rs.3 lakhs. He has also explained on various occasions in this House that farmers need protection. I would like to point out one thing. For giving loans to farmers, money is released by the Government to the NABARD and the cooperative institutions. Through them, farmers are getting loans for raising their crops. On more than one occasion, I have raised this issue in this august House that the farmer is given the loan, even if he gives the application at the time of the sowing season, only after the harvesting season. This is the lacuna. Whether it is through the NABARD or through cooperative institutions, farmers have to be provided the money at the time of their sowing season. There should be full support for farmers by banking institutions. I agree with the hon. Member when he said that the banks have been given the target of Rs.1,75,000 crores for giving loan to the farmers for raising crops. But, the banks have not risen up to the occasion. When a farmer goes to a bank for loan, the bank demands so many documents from him, though the guidelines are very clear in this regard. The farmer is made to go to the bank again and again. After some time, he loses interest in it and is unable to go to the bank for getting the loan. Therefore, my request to the hon. Finance Minister is when you bring a scheme, there should be a monitoring agency for it. The monitoring agency should be there at the State level and at the district level so that whenever the farmers face any problems, it can be redressed. But, the hon. Finance Minister has said on more than one occasion that he personally goes there to monitor the functioning of all the banks, as far as farmers' credit is concerned.

Sir, I find that there is one thrust area of rural housing on which the focus has been given. The Government has got various schemes for the SCs, STs and other people to provide them housing. There is a scheme for providing them permanent shelter. Under that scheme, the Government gives them Rs.25,000 for constructing a house. Then, money is also provided to the people in the urban areas under the Wambay Scheme to convert thatched roofing into pucca houses. I request the hon. Finance Minister to increase the allocation for the housing sector because, especially more than 40 per cent of the people in the rural areas in the Southern part of the country are living in thatched roofing. Therefore, I request the hon. Finance Minister to increase the allocation for the housing sector.

Sir, as far as providing health facilities to the people is concerned, the Government has got a very ambitious plan of 'Health for All'. Though the scheme has been announced, but the allocations made for it are not adequate. If we go to rural areas, we find that in the North India, there are no hospitals for an area which covers five-six hamlets. District-level hospitals are there; Also, there are hospitals at the taluka level. But, even for an area of five-six villages, which has got a large population, no hospitals are located there. My suggestion is, as the Government wants to achieve the target of 'Health for All', and when the Central Government is spending so much money in providing funds to the State Governments, the health facilities should reach the people in the rural areas. I request the hon. Finance Minister to have more focus on this area. After announcing the National Rural Health Mission, the Central Government should give more focus to it by assisting the States in opening more hospitals, whether it is a single-doctor hospital or a two-doctor hospital. So, I want that more focus should be given to this sector by creating more infrastructure in the rural areas.

Sir, as far as drinking water is concerned, there is a need to have protected drinking water in all the villages. This is a noble scheme. It was started when our leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister of our country. Under this Scheme, people in rural areas are getting protected drinking water. The people living in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and in desert areas are facing problem in getting protected drinking water. Late Rajivji started that scheme under five Technology Missions. But, even now, we find that people are not getting protected drinking water in villages. I am not blaming the State Governments for this; I am not blaming the Central Government for this. But, this is a national scheme in which the Centre and

the States have got a joint responsibility. Sir, it is not just that the people in the rural areas are not getting protected drinking water. Even in urban areas, people are getting contaminated drinking water. The people in the urban areas are not getting safe drinking water. This situation is there due to shortage of water, or, sometimes, proper facilities are not provided for filtering water. Sir, at the time of discussion on the working of the Ministry of Rural Development, I raised this point very categorically. The job of the Central Government is not just to provide for funds. When the State Governments are implementing the schemes of national programmes, the responsibility should be on both the Central Government and the State Governments. The Central Government should have a monitoring mechanism to see whether the schemes are being implemented properly or not. I am putting this point because there were complaints that the money sent for one scheme was not properly spent but was diverted to another scheme. There are a lot of complaints. The CAG reports are there to that effect.

Sir, the present UPA Government has given sufficient funds to the States, but even then the poverty-line, still, remains the same. Sir, we have to find out where we have faulted, where the lacuna is. I know, Sir, in the federal structure, it is very difficult for the Central Government to control the State Governments as far as financial matters are concerned. But a proper monitoring mechanism should be there; otherwise, when the Plan scheme and non-Plan scheme funds are provided by the Central Government to the State Governments under various projects and schemes, if the funds are diverted, then, the purpose for which the money is given is not met. Therefore, we cannot see the development. It applies to all the State Governments. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I am only speaking on the subject, but when somebody intervenes...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not take cognisance of the interventions. Please confine to your subject.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, the Pradhan Mantri Grameen Sadak Yojana is a very good scheme for rural roads. We found its impact in Andhra Pradesh, it has done very well. The credit goes to the earlier Government, it has done well. There is no party-line in that. It should be followed as a role-model in other States also. By that, the rural people would feel that they are getting all the facilities and amenities that are being provided by the State Government and the Central Government.

Sir, I support the Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2006, moved by the Finance Minister and I would like the Finance Minister to see to it that the monitoring mechanism is set in place to oversee the proper functioning of the schemes so that the desired results are given to the people. With these words, I thank you for having provided me an opportunity to speak on the Bill.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, thank you for permitting me to speak on this Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2006. I am aware of the limitations or constraints now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Also the constraint of time, two minutes!

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Yes, Sir. Sir, during the Budget Speech also I had raised certain points. I would like to touch upon the Bharat Nirman Programme of the Government of India. Sir, under the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, I appreciate the idea of constructing five lakh classrooms and inducting about 1.5 lakh teachers. As far as Mid-day Meals Scheme is concerned, we are paying a huge money by way of 2 per cent cess. I have got an answer from the hon. Minister regarding the Mid-day Meals Scheme during summer vacations. Sir, there are news reports from the States to say that they are not going to provide meals during the vacation period. The assurance given by the hon. Minister was that in the drought-affected districts, it is going to be implemented even during the summer vacation. But, surprisingly, I am told that in States like Andhra Pradesh, they are not going to provide meals, in those districts which are declared as backward districts, during summer vacations, in spite of the assurance given by the Government of India. I would like to request the hon. Minister to throw some light on this subject.

As far as the National Rural Health Mission is concerned, I have been saying right from the Consultative Committee meetings that not even one southern State is included in the National Rural Health Mission. It is a very ambitious programme and Rs.25,000 crores are going to be spent on this programme. The only reason given for non-inclusion is that they have certain parameters and by virtue of these parameters, no southern State is included under this. Are you going to penalise the performing States? What is the rationale behind this? On the other hand, you have to encourage them. By non-inclusion of Southern States in the National Rural Health Mission, we are gong to pay very high price for performing at the State level.

Sir, another programme is the National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme. We have about 600 districts and this programme is implemented initially for 200 districts only by merging two programmes, the Food for Work Programme and the SGR. Sir, earlier we used to have this new Food for Work for the entire State. Now it is confined to 200 districts in the country. I would like to request the Government to expand it to the entire country. Your promise through the NCMP was 'to enact a legislation immediately after coming to power'. I have a copy of the National Common Minimum Programme in my hands. In the opening sentences of the National Common Minimum Programme, though I call it as a 'national compulsion management programme', you have stated that 'the UPA Government will immediately enact an Employment Guarantee Act.' Already on a number of occasions, we have stated that one-third of your tenure is over, one-third of the districts are covered now, and you are going to achieve the required targets or set the goals by virtue of this, the Government has to explain, Sir. Another one is the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission. Major cities like Tirupati and Warangal in Andhra Pradesh are omitted whereas smaller cities are included in the programme. I have also made a Special Mention in this regard.

Now, coming to agricultural sector, Sir, farmers are depending on the vagaries of monsoon and they are subjected to all sorts of problems, right from seed to sale, seeds, fertilizers, Support Price, natural calamities, etc., after overcoming all these things, they are not getting remunerative prices. I want the Government to come out with a comprehensive programme for -- not Minimum Support Price, that should be 'minimum guarantee price' -- and to have chain of cold storages/godowns and all those things, infrastructure should be improved. We are very, very weak in post-harvest mechanism. I want that the Government should concentrate on post-harvest mechanism.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, I am concluding. The other aspect is interlinking of rivers. Sir, once again, I would like to remind the Minister that your assurance through NCMP is that 'the UPA Government will make a comprehensive assessment of the feasibility of linking rivers.' Now, you have not allocated any money. I would like to know whether this programme stands good or you have dropped the idea of linking the rivers. This is another one that needs attention.

Sir, the hon. Minister promised during the Budget reply that he would take all the suggestions into consideration while replying on the Finance Bill. Regarding reduction of interest rate on crop loan, which, as of now, is 9 per cent, it should be reduced. I would like to request the hon. Minister to waive off all the taxes on tractors which are being used in the agricultural sector - any tax, whether a State Government tax or a Central Government tax -- all taxes should be waived off as far as tractors which are engaged in the agricultural sector are concerned. Finally, I would like to thank my good friend, Mr. Naryanasamy for complimenting the then Government in Andhra Pradesh as far as infrastructure is concerned. I would like to request the hon. Minister to look at the unit cost of IAY houses. It is now Rs.25,000/-. It was fixed long back. Now the prices of steel, cement, etc. have gone up. The unit cost is inadequate and houses are left incomplete. I would like to request him to increase the unit cost as far as IAY houses are concerned, and also increase the number of units for the rural artisans like handloom weavers, fishermen and beedi workers. Sir, I have also narrated the plight of the handloom weavers earlier. We used to give 20 per cent rebate during festivals. Now it is reduced to 10 per cent. We used to give 30 per cent subsidy on Janata Cloth but now this programme has been disbanded.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude because there are other speakers also.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: I am concluding. The other one is PDS, the Public Distribution System. There is a proposal and people are having apprehensions that you are going to reduce the quantity, and you are increasing the issue price as far as the PDS is concerned. Sir, that does not sound a good idea. I would like to request the Minister to drop such an idea and there is no programme for OBCs in the entire Budget. I am unable to read a sentence as far as OBCs are concerned. I will conclude, Sir, and finally...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In two minutes speech, you are going on saying 'finally, finally'.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, I am in the habit of saying 'finally.' We used to get time in the courts by saying 'finally', 'last chance'. By saying like that we used to get time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are taking advantage of that.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, finally, I want to compliment you for coming back to this House again on your re-election. Try to cut the non-Plan expenditure and that savings can be used for the rural sector, more particularly, for the downtrodden, women, SCs and STs and weaker sections and minorities. With these words, I conclude. Thank you Sir.

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट (गुजरात) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, आपने मुझे Finance Appropriation Bill, 2006 पर बोलने का जो मौका दिया है, उसके लिए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

महोदय, मैं मानता हूँ कि यह सरकार की और हम सब की जिम्मेवारी है कि गरीबो की गरीबी कम हो, वे जहाँ पर हों, वहाँ सुखी हों, किसान जहाँ पर हो, उनको सस्ती बिजली मिले, पानी मिले और उनकी आर्थिक समृद्धि भी बढ़े। हम सब की इस प्रकार की योजना होनी चाहिए। लेकिन मैं इस बिल में कहीं-कहीं देखता हूँ कि जहाँ जरूरत है, वहाँ प्रावधान नही किया गया है और जहाँ जरूरत नहीं है, वहाँ प्रावधान करके खर्चे बढ़ाए जा रहे हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि ग्रामीण विकास के लिए पशुपालन एक ऐसा रोजगार है, जिसमें हरेक गरीब या बी0पी0एल0 के नीचे जीने वाला कुटुम्ब अपना गुजारा कर सकता है और पशुपालन के आधार पर ग्रामीण दूध-उत्पादकों को रोज़ी भी मिल सकती है। अगर किसान की एक फसल कम होगी, तो भी वह इस दूध-उद्योग के आधार पर अपना गुजारा अच्छी तरह कर सकेगा। इसलिए किसान पशुपालन और नई टेक्नोलॉजी के आधार पर कृषि कर सकें, उनको उस तरह की तालीम दी जाए। ऐसे रिसर्च सेन्टर्स हों, जहाँ उन किसानों को ले जा कर दिखाया जाए और वे अपने खेतों में नए प्रावधानों के आधार पर कृषि करके उसमें से ज्यादा आमदनी प्राप्त कर सकें। हमारी सरकार की ओर से उस तरह की योजनाएँ बननी चाहिए, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा कुछ नहीं दिखाई देता है।

राजीव गांधी ग्रामीण विद्युतीकरण योजना में आज भी 1 लाख 25 हजार गाँव बिना बिजली के हैं। इन गाँवों के स्वास्थ्य केन्द्रों और शिक्षा केन्द्रों में आज भी बिजली की सुविधा उपलब्ध नहीं है। मुझे यह तो मालूम नही है कि यह समस्या कितने सालों में खत्म होगी, लेकिन अगर सरकार संकल्प करे, तो वह हर काम पूर्ण कर सकती है। मैं ऐसा इसलिए मानता हूँ कि हमारे गुजरात में ज्योति ग्राम योजना चलाई गई और इससे एक ही साल में 18 हजार गाँवों में से 17 हजार गाँवों में 24 घंटे बिजली देने का प्रावधान हो सका है। लेकिन आजादी के इतने साल बाद भी आज तक पूरे देश में इन ग्रामीण गरीबों के लिए बिजली का प्रावधान नही हो सका है, यह एक दुखद बात है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह विनती करता हूँ कि वे इस तरह का प्रावधान करें कि इस साल ज्यादा प्रावधान करके भी, इसी साल हर गाँव में बिजली पहुँचे, हर स्वास्थ्य केन्द्र, हर शिक्षा केन्द्र में बिजली पहुँचे।

यदि ग्रामीण उद्योगों की बात करें तो मैं यह मानता हूँ कि ग्रामीण उद्योगों के तालीम केन्द्र बड़े-बड़े शहरों जैसे- दिल्ली, कोलकाता, मद्रास, मुम्बई में होते हैं, लेकिन वे ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में ही होने चाहिए, जहाँ मजदूर काम करते हैं। उन मजदूरों को तालीम दी जाए। आज कल मजदूर बी0पी0एल0 में ही जीने वाले होते हैं, क्योंकि उनको पूरे साल तो मजदूरी नहीं मिलती है। अत: इन मजदूरों को अच्छी तालीम दी जाए, ताकि उनके कार्य में उनकी आमदनी बढ़े,

उनको रोज़गार में बढ़ावा मिले, एक कारीगर होने के नाते उनको ज्यादा वेतन मिले और वे बी0पी0एल0 से बाहर निकल कर अच्छे कारीगर बन सकें। इसलिए ऐसे मजदूरों के लिए भी तालीम का प्रावधान करना चाहिए। तहसील केन्द्रों, जहाँ ऐसे केन्द्र चलते हैं, वहीं पर तालीम के लिए इंतजाम करने चाहिए। उनको केन्द्र सरकार की ओर से भी ग्रांट देकर प्रोत्साहित किया जाए, जिससे ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में इन कारीगरों के लिए भी सोचा जाए और गरीबों के लिए भी सोचा जाए। महोदय, दूसरी बात यह है कि डाक विभाग, जो पब्लिक सर्विस वाला क्षेत्र है, उसमें भी चूंकि नफा होता नहीं, नुकसान होता है, इसलिए उसके केन्द्र बंद किए जाते हैं। यह डाक विभाग आजकल गरीबों के लिए एक मात्र ऐसा साधन है, जिससे गरीब लोग अपने संबंधियों को संदेश भिजवा सकते हैं, क्योंकि दूर-संचार के साधन उन गरीब लोगों के पास नहीं हैं। इसलिए डाक विभाग के जो केन्द्र बंद किए जाते हैं, उनके लिए मैं विनती करुंगा कि डाक विभाग में अन्य सेवाओं को साथ में जोड़ते हुए, उनका नफा-नुकसान देखे बिना, अगर नुकसान हो तो भी, ये डाक केन्द्र बंद नहीं करने चाहिएं। यह जो पिछले दो साल से डाक केन्द्र बंद करने का प्रावधान शुरू किया गया है, उसको तत्काल रोका जाए और जहां पर बंद हुए हैं, उनको भी पुनः चालू करना चाहिए।

उपसभापति महोदय, आजकल पानी हर आदमी की जरूरत की चीज होती है और पानी एक ऐसी चीज है, जिसके लिए सैंकड़ों जगहों पर झगड़े हो जाते हैं। इस पानी को बचाने के लिए हमारी सरकार की ओर से प्रावधान होना चाहिए। इसमें एक प्रोब्लम यह हो गई है कि सरकार ने ऐसे सिंप्रकलें या ड्रिप एरिगेशन के साधन पर भी टैक्स लगा दिया है। छोटे-छोटे ग्रामोद्योगों में जो काम होते हैं, उनमें सबमर्सिबल पंप भी आते हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि गुजरात में कम से कम हमारे चार, साढ़े चार लाख कारीगर इस सबमर्सिबल पंप के काम में लगे हुए हैं। इनके ऊपर भी आपने 8 परसेंट का टैक्स लगा दिया है और आईएसआई ट्रेड-मार्क वाली जो कंपनी हैं, उनको एक करोड़ तक की आपने मुक्ति दे दी है। इससे ये जो ऐसे छोटे-छोटे उद्योग हैं, जिन पर आपने टैक्स डाल दिया है, ये छोटे-छोटे उद्योग बंद हो जाएंगे और इससे गरीबी और बेरोजगारी बढ़ेगी। मैं विनती करुंगा कि छोटे-छोटे जो एरिगेशन के साधन हैं, सबमर्सिबल पंप हैं, उनके ऊपर लगाए गए टैक्स को हटा दीजिए।

महोदय, हम गरीब की बात करते हैं, लेकिन गरीब के रहने के लिए जो मकान होता है, उनके ऊपर जो छत के लिए खपरैल डालते हैं, उसके ऊपर भी टैक्स डाला गया है। क्या सरकार इतनी गरीब हो गई है कि गरीब की छत के लिए पड़ने वाले खपरैल पर भी टैक्स डाला जाए? इस तरह गरीब कहां से मकान बना सकेंगे? स्टील या आरसीसी के मकान तो वे बना नहीं सकते हैं, वे तो ऐसी छतें बनाकर जीते हैं। इसलिए इनके ऊपर लगाए गए टैक्स को भी हटाया जाए। इसके साथ ही मैं यह मानता हूँ कि गरीबों के लिए जो गेहूं खाद्य सामग्री वितरण वाले केन्द्र पर 9/-रुपए में बेचते थे, उनका भाव बढ़ाकर 13/-रुपए कर दिया है। सरकार बात तो गरीबों की करती है, लेकिन उन पर टैक्स डालती है । मैं मानता हूँ कि यह भाव भी कम करने चाहिएं, इसके लिए आप कुछ भी करें, किसी भी तरह से करें।

श्री उपसभापति : आप कनक्ल्यूड कीजिए।

श्री जवन्ती लाल बरोट : गरीबों के लिए हम कुछ सोचें, यही मेरी विनती है।

महोदय, आयुर्वेद के लिए भी जो प्रावधान करना चाहिए था, उसमें कमी की है। जो एलोपैथी दवा होती है, वह आदमी के शरीर पर रिएक्शन करती है, उसका कुछ न कुछ रिएक्शन सामने आता है। इसलिए एलोपैथी की जगह होम्योपैथी और आयुर्वेदिक दवाओं, इनके ट्रीटमेंट पर ध्यान दिया जाए और उसका प्रचार किया जाए। इससे हर आदमी की तन्दुरुस्ती को फायदा रहेगा। इस ओर आपने कुछ सोचा नहीं है।

महोदय, यह जो हमारा गृह विभाग है। अपने देश में आजकल पड़ौसी देशों से सुरक्षा और आंतरिक सुरक्षा के बारे में बहुत चिंता होनी चाहिए, लेकिन आंतरिक सुरक्षा के लिए हमारी पुलिस के पास पूरे साधन नहीं हैं, हमारी पुलिस के पास नए आधुनिक इन्स्ट्रूमेंट नहीं हैं। आतंकवादी लोग जो देश के अंदर छुपे हुए हैं या जो छुपे हुए गद्दार लोग हैं, उनको ढूंढने के लिए पुलिस को जो साधन चाहिएं, वे उनके पास नही हैं। मैं यह विनती करुंगा कि हमारे गुजरात के बगल में महाराष्ट्र में ऑर्गेनाइज्ड क्राइम को रोकने के लिए एक्ट है, बाजू में राजस्थान में है, मध्य प्रदेश में है, लेकिन गुजरात में दो साल से यह ऑर्गेनाइज्ड क्राइम रोकने के लिए, जबसे पोटा रद्द किया है तब से पकड़े हुए आतंकवादियों पर उसे लगाने का प्रावधान न होने से, गुजरात सरकार ने इस प्रावधान के लिए मांग की हुई है। इस मांग को दो साल हो गए हैं, लेकिन केन्द्र सरकार इसकी मंजूरी नहीं दे रही है। मैं विनती करुंगा, क्योंकि महाराष्ट्र से निकलकर वही आतंकवादी गुजरात में आकर बैठेंगे तो गुजरात की जो शांति है, आज जो गुजरात की गरीब प्रजा वहां शांति से जीती है, उससे जीने का हक छिन जाएगा और यही आतंकवादी प्रवृत्ति अगर वहां बढ़ गई, तो उसको हटा नहीं सकेंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : कनक्ल्यूड कीजिए, बरोट जी।

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट : इसलिए मैं मांग करता हूँ कि गुजरात को तुरन्त मंजूरी दी जाए और गुजरात को जो इंटरनल सिक्योरिटी के लिए मदद करनी चाहिए, वह दी जाए।

श्री उपसभापति : श्री जेसुदासु सीलम।

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट : दो मिनट, सर। हमें बोलने का मौका तो मिलना चाहिए।

श्री उपसभापति : देखिए, एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल के ऊपर We have fixed one hour.

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट : सर, एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल में से यह जो प्रावधान निकाला है, उस पर हम बात तो करें।

श्री उपसभापति : देखिए, जो टाइम एलोकेट किया गया है, उसी में ही तो बात करना चाहिए। बजट पर बहस हो चुकी है, फिर इस पर दुबारा बहस करेंगे। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट : सर, लास्ट में एक बात कहूंगा कि हमें अपने पूरे देश से गरीबी हटानी है, किसान को आगे बढ़ाना है, तो जैसी हम कई साल से नदियों को जोड़ने की बात कर रहे हैं, उन नदियों को जोड़ने का कोई प्रावधान आज तक नहीं हुआ है, इसलिए मैं मांग करता हूँ कि उत्तर से दक्षिण तक सभी नदियों को जोड़ने के लिए एक ग्रिड योजना बनानी चाहिए। जब हम यह योजना बनाएंगे, तभी किसानों को पानी सस्ता मिल सकेगा और अगर अकाल भी होगा, तो भी पानी उन्हें मिलेगा, जिससे वे जी सकेंगे। इसी आधार पर गुजरात ने एक सुंदरम शुभम योजना बनाई है, जो 10 जिलों की 21 नदियों को जोड़ने की योजना है और यह

6,700 करोड़ रुपए की योजना है। इसकी मंजूरी केन्द्र ने दे दी है। मेरी विनती है कि केन्द्र सरकार गुजरात को इसमें आर्थिक सहायता दे और सिंचाई लिए जो अकाल वाला एरिया है, वहां पानी पहुंचाने के लिए राज्य सरकार की योजना में केन्द्र मदद करे।

सर, मैं आपका आभार मानता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस मुद्दे पर बोलने का मौका दिया। धन्यवाद।

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM (Andhra Pradesh): Hon. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Appropriation Bill, moved by the hon. Finance Minister. I have been closely listening to my senior friends from the other side. I would like to compliment, congratulate and thank the hon. Finance Minister. We have been hearing, for the last two years, the concerns the Government have expressed, and that is reflected in the allocations, especially, for farmers, the agricultural sector and the health sector. At the same, the flagship programmes which takes care of the basic facilities, Bharat Nirman etc.; and the message we send through the employment generation schemes. We do keep in touch with the grassroot level workers. It is sending a very good message. I really thank him. For the last eight years, we are not hearing any of these programmes. I don't know how they (in the NDA) can say, "This is not done, that is not done". I request them to kindly introspect what they have been doing for the last six years. And, of course, they felt the pulse of the people also.

At the same time, when I am happy and congratulating the Finance Minister, I do have certain concerns. I am really disappointed looking at the lot of talkism in some respects, but allotment is tokenism. That is the pain that I would like to share with the House and put forward, through you, Sir, to the hon. Finance Minister. For instance, I was very hopeful when I heard his statement, last year. The welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes is closest to my heart. But I am disappointed. I appealed to him last year also. This year, again, he says that the Government is committed to the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. I also feel very happy. But, while looking at the figures, I am amazed to see that out of the total Plan Outlay of Rs. 1,72,727.85 crores, merely 0.71 per cent, that is, Rs. 1,226 crores, is allotted for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes. This is only a token amount of 13 per cent rise over the total Budget rise compared to a general rise of 20.4 per cent. I would have been happy if he could have increased, in the same rate at least, as he increased the Budget figures for the total Plan Outlay. Similarly, in the case of the Scheduled Tribes, it is only 0.96 per cent. It is not even one per cent. If both, the SCs and STs, are put together, the allotment

from both plan and non-plan is 0.51 per cent. While, the population of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, if put together, is 25 per cent. For a population of 25 per cent, in this country, you are giving a total amount of 0.5 per cent of the total Budget. I don't think this is a fair deal. I don't have much time. So, very briefly, I would mention that there is, what is called, the Special Central Assistance to the States under the Special Component Plan. It has been slashed by 10 per cent, this year. Last year, it was given Rs. 491 crores; while, this year, it has been reduced to Rs. 440 crores. Sir, you know that atrocities are committed on the Scheduled Castes day in, and day out, but the conviction is zero. Can't we think of strengthening the machinery for implementing this special Act by allocating more money? Not even a single rupee is allocated more than the last year. There is no increase. It is shameful that, in this country, six lakh families are still removing the dirt with their hands. There are six lakh *safai karamcharis*, who are working as scavengers. But if you look at the allocation of post-matric scholarships made for their children, merely Rs. 16 crores were allotted last year; there is not even one rupee increase. Sir, what is this? What message are we sending to the scavenger community who are working in the menial job, which is stigmatised, and it is low paid? It is not a fair deal. I would like to submit this to the hon. Finance Minister. Sir, you know that the Scheduled Castes Development Finance Corporation was established to match the States efforts to give. I am happy that he has increased the share capital. But the allocation has been reduced almost by 50 per cent. Last year it was Rs. 27 crores. Now, it is Rs. 11.5 crores; it is down this year. Similarly, there are schemes for post matric scholarship, book banks, upgradation of merits for the Scheduled Tribe students. Sir, the allocation has been reduced. Earlier it was Rs. 230/- crores. Now it is reduced to Rs. 118 crores. Sir, again, the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes Development Corporation is there. For the last three years, we have reduced it. I can understand the NDA Government slashing it down. In this deduction, we have shown that we are no better than the NDA. I am very sorry to say this, Sir. We have not even matched their figures; we have come down. This is very unfortunate. Why I am saying this is because we must also discuss the truth. It has to be corrected now, otherwise, we will not be able to implement what we are saying. It has to be done in letter and spirit.

Sir, regarding this listing done by the Finance Minister, I am thankful that he has listed hundred per cent SC/ST Schemes under Part (a) and 20 per cent allocation of some of the Ministries under Part (b). It is

only a repetition of what SCP and TSP introduced by Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Sir, I would like to take two minutes on this genesis of the Scheduled Tribes Special Component Plan and Tribal Sub Plan. After the success of the Agricultural Revolution, a lot of things were told that the poorest were marginalized, the peasants were marginalized. Then came Naxalism. Naxalism was borne in 70s' in the wake of exploitation of the agricultural labourers by rich landlords after the Green Revolution. Shrimati Indira Gandhi thought that there is deprivation and to take away the feeling of deprivation, she focussed attention on Tribal Sub Plan. So, to attack this menace of Naxalism, for the first time, the Tribal Development was thought. The Integrated Intensive Tribal Development, a separate head was made. A separate officer was there and all the line Departments were reporting to him to send a message of proper development of Tribes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Sir, if you want me to sit, I will sit. But I thought I should tell the House that there is a need to rethink. Similar conditions were prevailing after the late 60s' and because of the exploitation of the labour in the wake of the Green Revolution naxalism was borne. There was a lull now because of our so-called economic reforms. I don't want to call them economic reforms. Reform is a great word. Reform is a positive word. What Raja Rama Mohan Roy did was real reform. Land reform is real reform. These are only economic policies. The economic policies, I am sorry, are tilted towards the marginalisation of the poorest in this country. That is acclaimed. If you want, kindly see how many poor have come to benefit from the so-called economic reforms. This policy has now marginalized so many sections that they are going back to Naxalism.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Seelam, you should have participated in the debate on the Budget rather than on the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Sir, I am giving the philosophy behind the Budget. The budget makers should have taken all these into consideration. These naxalite activities are not only confined to tribal areas, they are going to the plain areas also. The non-tribals are also getting into it. So, I would submit that this listing of the hundred per cent aided or if you want to say that hundred per cent listed Departments where allocation

12.00 NOON

was made and where 20 per cent allocation, though it is a repetition of SCP and TSP, if you add up the entire Plan amount in List (a), it comes to Rs. 11,896 crores.It is only 6.89 per cent. The SC population in this country is 16.2. ...*(Time-bell)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Similarly, for the tribals, the non-Plan and the Plan put together, it is 695, mere a token of .4 per cent. Sir, I would like to sum up by saying that this listing out is fine, but once it is listed, allocation has to be released, and the released amount has to be spent. This is part (a). Part (b) is, the demand of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, through their representatives, is that the percentage equivalent proportion of plan funds, at least, Plan funds, should be spent on their welfare, through a proper mechanism, a proper mechanism not only at the State and Centre level, but also at the district level. I can understand, the hon. Finance Minister may say that certain amounts like defence cannot be earmarked. I am saying, Sir, that please spend 15 per cent of the defence money on SC/ST boys/girls to prepare themselves to compete, because there is no reservation in defence. We want Government to spend that money for preparing them to enter the Defence Forces, without any reservation *(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, you are just making a speech. Please conclude.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Sir, I wanted to speak at the time of Budget debate but I was not given an opportunity.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:Your Party has been given only twenty minutes. You yourself have taken ten minutes.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Where do I speak, Sir? If I cannot speak here, where can I articulate the aspirations of the poor? I would only submit that okay, whatever is allotted, we are grateful for that. I am grateful that, for the first time, you have listed out certain Ministries, because it was never existent for the last six years. We are only hopeful that the trend is reversed by the hon. Finance Minister. We only request that whatever amount is allocated, must be released on time. Even today, about 53 per cent of SC/ST money has not gone to the States.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude, Mr. Seelam.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Now, you are left with only ten days. They have to spend it. What is the point in allocating this, Sir? ...*(Time-bell)*... This allocation should be spent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are repeating the same thing. Please conclude. Please conclude.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Thank you, very much, Sir. I, once again, compliment for reversing this trend, and we, only, request, that the hon. Finance Minister may kindly see that certain corrections are made while answering...*(Interruptions)*

श्री दत्ता मेघे (महाराष्ट्र): एस0सी0, एस0टी0 के पैसे नहीं जाएंगे तो ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM: Who will be answering, Sir? Who will tell us? If I go to the Ministry for Social Welfare, they say, "we will not be able to answer it".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What I am saying is, you have already said this. Don't repeat. Even if you want to cover, you can cover new points, not the same points. Please conclude.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM : Sir, these amounts may kindly be enhanced, as per our demands. If you want the SC/ST empowerment in a meaningful way, their needs have to be specifically identified. What they need is, quality education; what they need is, basic health facilities in the villages; what they need is proper implementation of what we say. What we do is different from what we say. ...*(Time-bell)*... We request you to kindly stick to the allocations and spend them properly. And, once, again, I thank the hon. Finance Minister, for, at least, reversing the trend of non-existent allocations to original. I would only hope that whatever corrections can be made can be made now ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Vanga Geetha. Your party time is over, but you have been permitted by the Chairman only to raise that particular issue.

SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I thank you for having given me this opportunity. I will confine myself to only one point. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the issue of exploitation by the moneylenders in the name of micro-financing the State of Andhra Pradesh. Sir, the people are being trapped and exploited, and,

they are being forced to pay interest rates, ranging from 36 to 50 per cent, and, in some cases, hundred per cent also. Sir, there are number of instances where people have committed suicides, and poor women also forced into prostitution. Their exploitation is continuing. It is widely reported in the newspapers. I am quoting the issue from the item published in the leading Telugu daily, '*Eenadu*'. The whole issue has been reported in this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't show the papers.

SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA: Sir, we need to control these illegal and coercive methods of money-lenders. I request that the Government of India should initiate and take stringent action and save the poor. Sir, the Collectors of Krishna and Guntur districts of Andhra Pradesh have openly come out against these private micro-finance institutions and exploitation of the women.

Sir, I request the Government of India to bring out a comprehensive legislation to curb such illegal activities and save the people and women from this exploitation.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, on this issue, we gave a notice as it is a matter of urgent public importance. The reason is ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you need not explain it. She has already explained it. Leave it, Mr. Reddy. ...*(Interruptions)*... Prof. Bhandary. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, VVIPs from ...*(Interruptions)*... They are going there and encouraging those micro-financing institutions. In the name of NGOs, they are exploiting the people. This should be curbed. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She has already mentioned that. There is no point in further elaborating it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, it is a very serious matter. Ninety-one people in one district ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; no; whatever she wanted to say, she has said. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, it is a very major issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: We wanted to raise it through a Special Mention.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can give a notice for a Special Mention. We have not prevented you from doing that.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, I would request the Minister, through you, to take some stringent action against these people. We will pass on this information to him. Let him make take some stringent action. We will pass it on to him. We will pass it on to him.

SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA: Sir, I will pass on this information to the hon. Finance Minister for taking necessary action.

प्रो0 राम देव भंडारी (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभापति जी, मैं आपका आभार व्यक्त करता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया है। उपसभापति जी, आज भी ग्रामीण विकास मंत्रालय और पंचायती राज मंत्रालय पर चर्चा होने वाली है। मैं अपने विचार गांव, कृषि और किसान के संबंध में व्यक्त करना चाहता हूं। महोदय, जब आजादी मिली थी, तब पूरे भारत ने एक सपना देखा था कि आजादी की रोशनी न सिर्फ शहरों में बल्कि 70 फीसदी से अधिक गांवों में बसने वाले जो लोग हैं, उन तक पहुंचेगी। मगर 58 वर्ष के बाद, आज भी गांवों की जो आर्थिक स्थिति है, उसमें कोई बहुत बड़ा परिवर्तन नहीं आया है। आप आज भी किसी गांव में चले जाइये, वहां पर सड़क नहीं है, बिजली नहीं है, पानी नहीं है, स्वास्थ्य और शिक्षा की सुविधा नहीं है, ये जो मूलभूत आवश्यकताएं हैं, इनका अभी भी गांवों में अभाव है।

महोदय, इस बार के बजट में इसके लिए सरकार द्वारा अधिक पैसा रखा गया है और हम आशा करते हैं कि यह पैसा खर्च होने के बाद गांव की स्थिति में कुछ परिवर्तन होगा, जो अभी तक नहीं हुआ है। सरकार पैसा तो यहां से भेजती है, मगर जिस काम के लिए भेजती है, जहां वह पैसा लगना चाहिए, वहां पर वह पैसा नहीं लगता है, इसीलिए जो आर्थिक मजबूती गांव में आनी चाहिए, वह नहीं आती है।

आज भी गांवों में पीने का पानी नहीं है, तालाबों से पीने का पानी लाना पड़ता है, जहां से पशु भी पानी पीते हैं और लोग भी पानी पीते हैं। वहां पर पेयजल की व्यवस्था नहीं है, स्वास्थ्य की व्यवस्था नहीं है, शिक्षा की व्यवस्था नहीं है, सफाई की व्यवस्था नहीं है, तो फिर यह आजादी किस काम की? बापू ने एक सपना ग्राम स्वराज का देखा था। बापू ने कहा था कि विकास की रोशनी गांवों में जो सबसे गरीब लोग हैं, उन तक पहुंचनी चाहिए। इस बजट में गांव में घर बनाने के लिए पैसे का प्रावधान किया गया है। इंदिरा आवास योजना गांवों में चल रही है, उससे लाभ हो रहा है, मगर अभी भी गांवों पर अधिक खर्च करने की आवश्यकता है। सिंचाई की व्यवस्था नहीं है, 80 प्रतिशत किसान लघु और सीमांत है। 1951 में, 51 प्रतिशत योगदान सकल

घरेलू उत्पादन में कृषि का था। आज घटते-घटते लगभग 24 प्रतिशत पर आ गया है। खेती के 60 प्रतिशत ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं, जहां सिंचाई की सुविधा नहीं है। गांवों से लोगों का पलायन हो रहा है, शहरों में भीड़ बढ़ती जा रही है। अगर हम चाहते हैं कि देश में सच्ची आज़ादी हो, सच्चे अर्थों में देश आज़ाद हो, तो गांव की जो अर्थ व्यवस्था है, गांव में जो विकास की रोशनी जानी चाहिए, गांव में जो शिक्षा और स्वास्थ्य की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए, वह अवश्य हो, नहीं तो आज़ादी का कोई महत्व नहीं रह जाता है। मैं जानता हूं कि हमारी सरकार ने, यूपीए की सरकार ने गांवों के विकास के लिए एक मिशन बनाया है, मगर उस मिशन को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए, उस मिशन को लागू करने के लिए आवश्यकता है कि ग्राम पंचायतों के माध्यम से उस व्यवस्था को लागू किया जाए। महोदय, 1978 में बिहार में ग्राम पंचायत के चुनाव हुए। उसके बाद दुबारा फिर, जब राष्ट्रीय जनता दल की सरकार थी, उस समय हुआ। भारी संख्या में जो गरीब लोग थे, जो दबे-पिछड़े लोग थे, वे जीतकर आए। गांवों में पहले सामंती राज होता था। गांव में जो सबसे बड़ा आदमी होता था, वह उसका मुखिया होता था। कोई उसके खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए तैयार नहीं होता था। 1990 में लालू प्रसाद जी की सरकार बनी। महोदय, मैं बिहार से आता हूं। मैंने देखा है कि जब चुनाव का समय आता था तो पांच आदमी बूथ पर जाकर खड़े हो जाते थे, जब गरीब लोग वोट डालने के लिए आते थे, तब वे कह देते थे कि तुम्हारा वोट गिर गया, तुम घर चले जाओ। वह पांच आदमी बूथ पर बैठे रहते थे, बोगस वोटिंग करवाते थे। 1990 में लालू प्रसाद जी की सरकार आई और उस सरकार के आने के बाद बिहार में एक क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन हुआ। गरीबों में एक क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन हुआ। शेडयूल्ड कास्ट, शेडयूल्ड ट्राइब्स और पिछड़ी जातियों के लोगों में एक क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन हुआ। उसी का नतीजा था कि एक बहुत ही गरीब परिवार के लालू प्रसाद जी बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री बने।

श्री उपसभापति : भंडारी जी, यह एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल है, इस पर संक्षेप में बोलिए।

प्रो0 राम देव भंडारी : मैं गांव की बात कर रहा हूं, हमने देखा है महोदय ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री उपसभापति : देखिए, इसके लिए एक ही घंटा फिक्स हुआ है, डिबेट नहीं हो रही है। यह एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल है इसलिए इसको थोड़ा सा ध्यान में रखें।

प्रो0 राम देव भंडारी : इस संदर्भ में ये बातें आ गयी हैं। मैं कह रहा हूं कि बिहार जैसे प्रदेश में गरीबों की क्या स्थिति थी, उन्हें वोट तक नहीं देने दिया जाता था, उनसे बंधुआ मजदूरी करवाई जाती थी, उनके परिवार के लोगों के साथ दुर्व्यवहार किया जाता था। आज़ादी के बाद इसमें बड़ा परिवर्तन होना चाहिए, सामाजिक परिवर्तन होना चाहिए, राजनैतिक परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। बिहार में राजनैतिक परिवर्तन हुआ, खास करके लालू जी के आने के बाद, उससे भी पहले कर्पूरी ठाकुर जी बिहार में थे, उन्होंने गरीबों की लड़ाई लड़ी। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि गांव में गांववालों की अपनी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए, विकास गांव के माध्यम से होना चाहिए। सर, मैं समझता हूं कि पंचायती राज मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हैं...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री उपसभापति : उसके ऊपर आप पंचायती राज पर बात कर सकते हैं, ।

प्रो0 राम देव भंडारी : महोदय, मुझे यह कहते हुए खुशी हो रही है कि मैंने प्रस्ताव दिया था - जब बैठक हो रही थी, मेरा प्रस्ताव था कि पंचायती राज व्यवस्था पर, ग्रामीण विकास

व्यवस्था पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए। माननीय चेयरमैन साहब ने उसे मंजूर किया, मैं उनके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करता हूं, मेरी पार्टी की ओर से हमारे एक माननीय सदस्य ने इस पर चर्चा की है। मेरा समय नहीं था, इसलिए थोड़ी सी बातें, इसी एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल के माध्यम से मैंने रखी हैं। मैं पुनः माननीय मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि जब तक देश में गांवों का विकास नहीं होगा, गांवों में रहने वाले जो 70 प्रतिशत लोग हैं, उनके घरों तक विकास की रोशनी, आज़ादी की रोशनी नहीं पहुंचेगी, तब तक देश में सच्ची आज़ादी नहीं कही जाएगी। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल का समर्थन करता हूं। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री मोती लाल वोरा (छत्तीसगढ़) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं विनियोग (संख्यांक 3) विधेयक, 2006 का समर्थन करता हूं। मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी को इस बात के लिए धन्यवाद दूंगा कि जो यू.पी.ए. सरकार का न्यूनतम साझा कार्यक्रम रहा है, उस साझा कार्यक्रम के अंतर्गत जिन कार्यक्रमों को वर्ष 2005-06 में लिया गया है, उससे निश्चित रूप से देश की परिस्थिति में बदलाव आएगा। मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि किसानों के बारे में आपने बहुत कुछ रियायत दी है, ब्याज की दर को भी सात प्रतिशत किया है, लेकिन किसान को केंद्रीय सहकारी बैंक से जो ऋण लेना पड़ता है, उसे भारी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ता है और उसे बहुत कागज़ात भरने पड़ते हैं। इसके साथ-साथ, मैंने तो प्रत्यक्ष इस बात को देखा है कि अगर वह किसान डीफॉल्टर है, क्योंकि अकाल की स्थिति देश के अनेक प्रदेशों में रहती है, अकाल की स्थिति में जो किसान अपने ऋण को नहीं पटा पाता है, उसे दोबारा ऋण लेने के लिए एड़ी-चोटी का ज़ोर लगाना पड़ता है, उसे ऋण नहीं मिलता है। हम कृषि की पैदावार को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, तो कृषि की पैदावार को बढ़ाने की दिशा में अगर हमने इन प्राथमिक इकाइयों को, केंद्रीय सहकारी बैंक, केंद्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक में जिस प्रकार की आज कठिनाइयां किसानों को आ रही हैं, इस दिशा में अगर हमने प्रयत्न किया, तो निश्चित रूप से देश में किसानों को लाभ मिलेगा और लाभ मिलने के साथ-साथ देश मे कृषि के उत्पादन में वृद्धि होगी।

माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आधा मिनट और लूंगा। महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि देश को अगर खुशहाल बनाना है, तो देश के गांवों को आत्मनिर्भर बनाना होगा और देश के गांव शहरों पर निर्भर न रहें, उसके लिए उन्होंने कहा था। इस बजट में भी माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने इन बातों का प्रावधान किया है कि गांव आत्मनिर्भर तब होंगे, जब गांवों के अंदर स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं, शिक्षा की सुविधा, सिंचाई के साधन और उसके साथ-साथ अन्य सुविधाओं का, जो उसकी आवश्यकताएं हैं, जो गांव के लोगों की आवश्यकताएं हैं वह पूरी हो, ताकि गांव के लोग अपने गांव में ही उनका उत्पादन करें और शहरों पर निर्भर न रहे। मुझे विश्वास है कि "भारत निर्माण योजना" के अंतर्गत और जो हमारी "राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोज़गार गारंटी योजना" है, इसमें बहुत अधिक लोगों को लाभ मिलेगा। "काम के बदले अनाज योजना" को आपने इसमें शामिल किया है। मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि "काम के बदले अनाज योजना" को आप लागू रहने दीजिए। इससे यह होगा कि आप "राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोज़गार गारंटी प्रोग्राम" के अंतर्गत तो एक परिवार में एक व्यक्ति को सौ दिन का रोज़गार देंगे, लेकिन "काम के बदले अनाज योजना" में उस गांव के अंदर, रबी और खरीफ की फसल के बाद गांव की स्थिति जिस प्रकार की हो जाती है, ऐसे में गांव के लोगों को रोज़गार की आवश्यकता होती है, मुझे विश्वास है कि माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी अवश्य इस पर ध्यान देंगे। यही कहते हुए मैं इस विनियोग विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूं।

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, it is stated that some of the industrialists, who earn more than Rs.10 crores, pay no tax and whereas the Government employees pay the tax and even the employees of the private sector also. Sir, it is stated by the hon. Member of this House who was also the former Finance Secretary and the former Reserve Bank Governor. He raised that point in the Budget discussion. But, unfortunately, the Finance Minister has not answered this and, I tell you, Sir, it is going to give a wrong message to the entire country. Will the hon. Minister take some steps to cover these people also under taxation laws? Thank you.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the nine hon. Members who participated in this brief and in someway a curtailed debate. But there is pressure on time, I have to be in two Houses. So, I will try to deal with many of the points that they have made. We have dealt with at great length the philosophy behind the Budget and many of the questions that were raised I made an attempt to answer in my reply to the General Debate in the Budget. This, of course, is only the Appropriation Bill, concentrating on the Expenditure side and how we are allocating money to various Heads of Expenditure, various Ministries and various Departments. Sir, in my opening remarks I did point out the massive allocations that we have made to the flagship programmes and the massive allocations were made to the six components of the *Bharat Nirman*. Just to recall the figures, for the flagship programmes, the allocation has increased from Rs.39,500 crore in the Revised Estimates for the current year to nearly Rs. 55,000 crore in the Budget Estimates for the next year. There are also other programmes like the Indira Awas Yojana, Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojana where huge outlays have been made. For Bharat Nirman, as I said, against the Revised Estimate allocation of Rs.13,907 crore for the current year, the allocation for the next year will be Rs.19,415 crore. So, I don't think that anyone can really say that the allocations are not adequate. Having regard to our resources, I think, we have strained every nerve to make larger and larger allocations.

Some comments were made upon decreasing subsidies. I am afraid, that is wrong. Subsidies are not decreasing. The subsidy level has been maintained at the same level of about Rs.46,000 odd crore. Food, domestic urea, imported urea, de-controlled fertiliser, petroleum - the subsidies are being maintained. But, as I said, one does not look at the allocation for subsidy because in food, we have been running account for

the Food Corporation of India. Similarly, in fertiliser, there is a running account with the fertiliser companies. There are some arrears to be paid, but arrears are paid as and when revenues permit it and we are also looking at innovative instruments to pay off the arrears of the Food Corporation of India. Cabinet has just approved special bonds for them. Let not anyone worry that subsidies will be curtailed. I have repeatedly said in the House that in a poor country, some part of the food has to subsidies. Equally, in a country where a large proportion is that of farmers, some part of the fertiliser cost has to be subsidised. If there are two subsidies which have to be carried in any developing country like India, they are food subsidy and fertiliser subsidy. Even in the paper on subsidies, which I first presented in 1997, and an updated paper, which I have presented last year, there is no attempt to curtail the food and fertiliser subsides. These are what we call 'merit subsidies'. There are 'non-merit subsidies'. The attempt is to focus on non-merit subsidies and progressively reduce the non-merit subsidies. Food subsidies and fertiliser subsidies are merit subsidies. What we are proposing is not to curtail the subsidies but to target them at the truly poor and the needy. The fertiliser subsidies can be given directly to the farmer. That, I think, would be an improvement on the present system. Similarly, if food subsidies can be targeted in a manner so that the cost of delivering the subsidy is not greater than the subsidy, then, I think, you get more money, more bang for the buck. The cost of delivering food subsidy today, according to the Economic Survey, is more than the cost of subsidy itself. Therefore, what we are proposing is that food subsidy must be targeted and delivered in a manner so that cost of delivery does not exceed the subsidy and the fertiliser subsidy must be targeted in a manner where it reaches the farmer directly. We are working on that.

Sir, Mr. Narayanasamy said about allocation to the Food-for-Work Programme and the NREGP. Sir, the allocation to the Rural Employment Guarantee Programme is based on some assumptions. As I said, we are allocating Rs.12,870 crore, of which the initial allocation in the SGRY is Rs. 2,700 crore. The food component is not provided, as a matter of practice, in the Budget Estimates. The food component is reflected in the Revised Estimates. Say, for example, take the current year. We began by saying that for SGRY, allocation was Rs.3,600 crore, but at the end of the year, it was Rs. 7,650 crore. We are following a consistent accounting practice. The food component is not entirely reflected in the Budget Estimates; it is reflected in the Revised Estimates. That, again, is an accounting issue. NREGP is an obligation under law that anyone who

presents himself as one member of the household and demands employment, he has to be provided employment for 100 days. Therefore, the money that is being provided is based on estimates. If more money is required during the course of the year, more money will indeed be provided. There is no question of avoiding the obligation under law.

Sir, Mr. Reddy mentioned about various allocations; allocation for the Mid-day Meal Scheme and the Rural Health Mission. Allocations have been made for Mid-day Meal Scheme and the Rural Health Mission. As the scheme is implemented, we will know whether the allocations are adequate or not. As far as we are concerned, these are flagship programmes, these are important programmes and these are our obligations. I believe, enough money has been allocated, but as the year progresses and we see the capacity of the Ministries and the States to spend, we can revisit these figures later.

Now, I come to the Non-Plan expenditure. Sir, this is one of the lowest increases in the Non-Plan expenditure in many years. Please look at 'Budget at a Glance'. The Non-Plan expenditure increases from Rs. 3,64,914 crore to Rs. 3,91,263 crore, which, I believe, is one of the smallest increases in recent years. We have actually squeezed a lot of Non-Plan expenditure. But, as I said, bulk of the Non-Plan expenditure is committed; interest payments are committed, Defence is committed, salaries and pensions are committed, subsidies are committed expenditure, and, there is not much room to play around with Non-Plan expenditure. Even so, we have limited the rise of non-Plan expenditure to approximately 5.5 per cent, which is one of the lowest increases in recent years.

Sir, Mr. Barot mentioned about allocations to Animal Husbandry. Sir, in the current year, we allocated Rs. 367 crores. We think, by the Revised Estimates, they will be able to spend only Rs. 305 crore. So, if they can only spend Rs. 305 crore in the current year, for the next year, we have provided Rs. 378 crore. I think, Parliament should call each Ministry/Department to account, when the outcome Budget is presented and the Chair allows a discussion on outcome Budget, to ask them, "why did you spend less than what was allocated".

There is no point in allocating money unless money is spent. For Rural Electrification, where it is being done through the NTPC, NHPC and the public sector agencies, the allocation is increasing from Rs. 1,100 crore in the current year Revised Estimate to Rs. 3,000 crores in the next year.

So, let them spend the money, and, then, we will see what requires to be allocated. For Indira Awas Yojana, we allocated in the BE Rs. 2,498 crore. They have spent nearly all of it. They have spent Rs. 2,475 crore. For the next year, I have increased it to Rs. 2,625 crore.

Sir, likewise, for the SC/ST, the allocation for the current year was Rs. 11,040 crore and they have been able to spend Rs. 11,492 crore. For the next year, we are proposing Rs. 12,591 crore, and, since hon. Member has -- I must congratulate him -- looked into what we call Statement No. 21, I would urge all hon. Members to look at Statement No. 21. It is not correct to say that Statement No. 21, which is on page 62 of Expenditure Budget Volume-I, is the only money that is being spent on SCs/STs. These are what we call exclusive schemes for SC/ST and where the SC/ST component is identifiable. But, when we spend on *Sarva-Siksha Abhiyan*, when we spend on Mid-day Meal Scheme, when we spend on rural electrification, the benefits go to the entire population including the SC/ST. So, it would be wrong to compare the proportion of the SC/ST population and take this figure of Rs. 12,591 crore as a proportion of total expenditure, and, say that figures don't match each other. That would be - if I may say, with great respect -- rather superficial reading of the situation. These are exclusive allocations but the general spending on all projects also goes to the benefit of the SC/ST. Sir, there was some point about lending by cooperative banks, some point about moneylenders. Sir, as I said in an answer to a question last week, every State has got a law making it illegal for usurious rates of interests. This is the Anti-Usury Act. It is called by different names in different States. These laws are age-old laws. In Tamil Nadu, I believe, this law was passed in the 1930s. Every State has such a law. The point is, this law is not used by the State Governments. Under this law, any lending above a certain prescribed rate of interest - and if I recall, the rate of interest for lending to farmers is about 12 per cent or so - any contract, oral or written, where the rate of interest is above the prescribed rate of interest, is an illegal contract. That part of interest is illegal. Nobody can enforce it. But, the States must take action; take civil action and criminal action. Let me say, put six moneylenders in prison tomorrow under criminal law, half of the problem will be solved. But, the States are not taking this action. What is the point of the States in passing the buck to the Central Government when the power is with the State Governments to take action?

As far as micro finance is concerned, you will recall that in paragraph 55 of my Budget speech, I did mention that "A Bill to provide formal statutory framework to the promotion, development and regulation of the micro finance sector will be introduced in this Session". The Bill is more or less complete in the drafting. If all goes well, I will introduce it when the Parliament re-convenes on the 10th of May. That Bill will be introduced in the Budget Session of Parliament. And then, we can debate the merits of that Bill.

Sir, as far as lending by cooperative banks is concerned, cooperative banks, as I have said, are in a shambles. We have now worked out a Rs. 14,500 crore package, based on the Vaidyanathan Committee Report on revamp. I have held meetings with the State Finance Ministers. I have written to the Chief Ministers and the Finance Ministers. Every State has to sign an MoU. If the MoU is signed, a Special Audit will be conducted, beginning the 1st of April. After the Special Audit, money will be provided for bringing about the regulatory and legal amendments, and after that, money will be provided to restore the capital adequacy of the cooperative banks. It is a Rs. 14,500 crore package. I have already posed it to the Asian Development Bank. They are willing to support it. I will pose it to the World Bank. Let the Chief Ministers please instruct their Ministers to sign the MoU. I have started receiving letters from some States. They are willing to sign the MoU. Once the MoUs are signed, the cooperative banks will be restructured and restored to health. But, they must lend. Now, today, I have announced in the Budget, for crop loan, if the cooperative banks lend at 7 per cent, they shall, if they lend at 7 per cent, NABARD will provide refinance at an appropriate rate so that they can lend at 7 per cent. Today, what is happening is, the apex bank charges one and a half per cent, DCCB charges one and a half per cent and the PSES charges two per cent or two and a half per cent. Now, what is the justification? There is no justification to add one and a half per cent, one and a half per cent and then two and a half per cent. That adds another 6 per cent to the lending rate. Therefore, unless they confine themselves to 1 per cent at each level, then, from the refinance rate to add 3 per cent, you can't lend at 7 per cent. I will ensure that refinance is provided at a proper rate so that they can lend at 7 per cent. But, they must also get their house in order. And, I would urge the State Governments to get their house in order, as far as lending by cooperative banks is concerned.

Sir, Mr. Poojary mentioned the point about tax. I will deal with it in the Finance Bill. But, since he has raised it, I will deal with it. I am not happy that only about 80,000 people, who admit to an income of over Rs. 10 lakhs, pay tax. We know them. Every one of us knows a number of people who have an income of more than Rs. 10 lakhs, but they don't pay tax. It is in order to identify these people that we have got the Annual Information Report. It is to identify these people that we have asked banks to report on large cash transactions. We have now done surveys of what we call high spending on high value items. Letters have gone to a large number of spenders. I have taken the power in the Finance Bill to mandatorily allot PAN numbers. All this put together, we will zero in on the people who have got high incomes, high expenditure, but, don't pay tax. You may have seen an advertisement in this morning's paper where a man is wearing a mask and we say, "We know who you are. Pay your tax." We are zeroing in on these names. We have a large number of high value transactions. Seven items are there in the list. Every one of them, who has participated or is a party to these high value transactions, has been notified by a polite letter. We are expecting response from them. Some are responding. If they don't respond to our polite letter, we will probably send them a stronger statutory notice. But I am confident that this number will increase, and I will reach the bulk of these people with high incomes and high expenditure but 'low' or 'no' tax. It is inconceivable that there are only 80,000 people in this country who admit to have an income of Rs.10 lakh. I think there are enough in South Delhi alone; there are enough in Chandigrah alone; and there is an equal number in Ludhiana alone. How can it be that only 80,000 people admit to have an income of over Rs.10 lakh? It is a shocking state of affairs. But I am addressing it very seriously, and the results will be apparent. One reason the result will be apparent is the rise in Personal Income-tax this year. Most people are now beginning to pay their PIT. We will get better figures from March 15 of advance tax payment. But I am confident that I will reach them. I share Mr. Poojary's concern. I am at the job and we will reach these people.

Sir, I request the House to support the Appropriation Bill. I have to go to the Lok Sabha for the Finance Bill debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

> "That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the

services of the financial year 2006-07, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 4 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRIES OF PANCHAYATI RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT - *Contd.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. K. Malaisamy, your party has 11 minutes. Please, keep this time in view.

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for having given me this opportunity to speak on a very, very important subject, namely, Rural Development and Panchayati Raj. I am very much familiar with this subject as a person hailing from a village which is backward and as a person well aware of the problems and prospects of villagers.

Sir, India is a vast country with huge magnitude of rural base. That is why it is said that India lives in villages. Any development or growth in the country is meaningless unless it is translated in villages. Sir, the problems of villages are manifold. We are fully aware that one-third of the world's poor are in India; more than one-third of the total population of India are below the poverty line; and more than 50 lakh persons are unemployed. What I am trying to say is that the magnitude of the problem not only in villages but also all over the country is very, very huge. The problems in villages in particular are massive and gigantic. Hence, it is a great challenge indeed.

Sir, a right focus has been given on the development of villages ever since Independence. Several programmes were thought of, including